**AFFIDAVIT**

:: I :: First-middle-middle: Last name
hereinafter "Affirmant", do solemnly affirm, declare and state as follows:

1. Affirmant is competent to state the matters set forth herein.
2. Affirmant has knowledge of the facts stated herein.
3. Affirmant has relied upon the translation of The Charter of Runnymede 1215 (also known as The Great Charter and Magna Carta) as researched and prepared by the learned staff of the Magna Carta Research Project (https://magnacartaresearch.org/about/personnel)
4. All the facts herein are true, correct, complete and admissible as evidence, and if called upon as a witness, Affirmant will testify to their veracity.
5. The statement of plain facts contained herein form the Affirmant's Petition of Right to the King for the Restoration of the Rule of Law.

**Plain Statement of Facts**

1. The following is a matter of record from the published lectures of Sir Henry Sumner Maine when he writes of Julius Caesar's description of the Druids[1] and their role in Ireland

   "… the Druids were supreme judges in all public and private disputes; and that, for instance, all questions of homicide, of inheritance, and of boundary were referred to them for decision. He says that the Druids presided over schools of learning, to which the Celtic youth flocked eagerly for instruction, remaining in them sometimes (so he was informed) for twenty years at a time. He states that the pupils in these schools learned an enormous quantity of verses, which were never committed to writing; and he gives his opinion that the object was not merely to prevent sacred knowledge from being popularised, but to strengthen the memory. Besides describing to us the religious doctrine of the Druids, he informs us that they were extremely fond of disputing about the nature of the material world, the movements of the stars, and the dimensions of the earth and of the universe." [2] Lecture II, The Ancient Irish Law. p.31

   This is further supported from the translations of later manuscripts of Irish (Brehon) Law by the Commission for Publishing the Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland (1852-1894) established by the Irish Government. Feineachus – the name used by Gaelic speakers to describe the general laws of oral tradition within Ireland. It was common practice to recite the law, of which there were distinct areas or specialisations, at the commencement of a hearing. Note that the terminology '*hearing*' is still in use in modern day[3], reflecting the oral tradition of the law being spoken with judges and jurors *hearing* both the law and the evidence before adjudgment.

   "The Senchus of the men of Erin[4]: What has preserved it? The joint memory of two seniors, the tradition from one ear to another, the composition of poets, the addition from the law of the letter, strength from the law of nature; for these are the three rocks by which the judgments of the world are supported." Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland, Introduction to Senchus Mór and Law of Distress as contained in the Harleian Manuscripts Vol. I. (1865) p.31

[1] Caesar, Gallic War VI.13-16 extracts, 58 to 49 BC
[2] Maine, Sir. Lectures on the Early History of Institutions. John Murray, 1874.
[3] Brehon Law has continued to be referenced and included in the deliberations of both the Irish Free State High and Supreme Courts, as evidenced in the case Moore and Others v The Attorney General and Others (Moore v Attorney General [1929] IR 191 (High Court) and Moore v Attorney General [1934] IR 44 (Supreme Court))
[4] "Éirinn" is the dative case of the Irish word for Ireland – "Éire", genitive "Éireann"

The laws were originally written in the Béarla Feini, the Fenian dialect of Gaelic.[5] Irish or Gaelic Law also referred to as Brehon Law dates back thousands of years and comprises separate law-tracts that developed their own distinct terminology, examples being:

*Cain Law*: Being that which was enacted or solemnly sanctioned by national assemblies, was of universal obligation, and could be administered, only by professional adjudicators;

*Urradhus Law*: Law relating to local matters, modified by local assemblies and by local customs, and which might be administered by the kings and flaiths who, though law was an essential part of their education, were not by profession either adjudicators (Brehons), professors (ollamhs) or lawyers.

*Senchus Mór*: Law of Distress as contained in the substantial Harleian Manuscripts includes a compilation of records of the grievances and remedies provided as examples for the four kinds of distress.[6]

2. Sir William Blackstone on record from his *Commentaires* (1753) on the **Natural Law** and **Divine Law**, establishing the doctrines upon which they exist and that they are superior to human laws:

"… the Creator is a being not only of infinite power, and wisdom, but also of infinite goodness, he has been pleased so to contrive the constitution and frame of humanity, that we should want no other prompter to inquire after and pursue the rule of right, but only our own self-love, that universal principle of action. For he has so intimately connected, so inseparably interwoven the laws of eternal justice with the happiness of each individual, that the latter cannot be attained but by observing the former; and, if the former be punctually obeyed, it cannot but induce the latter. In consequence of which mutual connection of justice and human felicity, he has not perplexed the law of nature with a multitude of abstracted rules and precepts, referring merely to the fitness or unfitness of things, as some have vainly surmised, but has graciously reduced the rule of obedience to this one paternal precept, "that man should pursue his own true and substantial happiness."

This is the foundation of what we call ethics, or natural law; for the several articles into which it is branched in our systems, amount to no more than 'demonstrating that this or that action tends to man's real happiness, and therefore very justly concluding that the performance of it is a part of the law of nature; or, on the other hand, that this or that action is destructive of man's real happiness, and therefore that the law of nature forbids it.

This law of nature, being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God himself is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding over all the globe in all countries, and at all times: no human laws are of any validity, if contrary to this and such of them as are valid derive all their force and all their authority mediately or immediately, from this original. But, in order to apply this to the particular exigencies of each individual, it is still necessary to have recourse to reason, whose office it is to discover, as was before observed, what the law of nature directs in every circumstance of life, by considering what method will tend the most effectually to our own substantial happiness. And if our reason were always, as in our first ancestor before his transgression, clear and perfect, unruffled by passions, unclouded by prejudice, unimpaired by disease or intemperance, the task would be pleasant and easy; we should need no other guide but this. But every man now finds the contrary in his own experience; that his reason is corrupt, and his understanding full of ignorance and error.

[5] The Brehon Laws – A Legal Handbook, By Laurence Ginnell, Of The Middle Temple, and Irish Bar, Barrister-at-Law SECOND EDITION (1917). [Updated to reflect the publication of Fifth Volume of the Ancient Laws of Ireland (1894)]

[6] Ancient Laws and Institutes of Ireland, Introduction to Senchus Mór and Law of Distress as contained in the Harleian Manuscripts Vol. I. (1865) p. xi.

This has given manifold occasion for the benign interposition of divine Providence, while, in compassion to the frailty, the imperfection, and the blindness of human reason, hath been pleased, at sundry times and in divers manners, to discover and enforce its laws by an immediate and direct revelation.

The doctrines thus delivered we call the revealed or divine law, and they are to be found only in the holy scriptures. These precepts, when revealed, are round upon comparison to be really a part of the original law of nature, as' they tend in all their consequences to man's felicity. But we are not from thence to conclude that the knowledge of these truths was attainable by reason, in its present corrupted state; since we find that, until they were revealed, they were hid from the wisdom of ages. As then the moral precepts of this law are indeed of the same original with those of the law of nature, so their intrinsic obligation is of equal strength and perpetuity. Yet undoubtedly the revealed law is of infinitely more authenticity than that moral system which is framed by ethical writers, and denominated the natural law; because one is the law of nature, expressly declared so to be by God himself; the other is only what, by the assistance of human reason, we imagine to be that law. If we could be as certain of the latter as we are of the former, both would have an equal authority; but, till then, they can never be put in any competition together.

Upon these two foundations, the law of nature and the law of revelation, depend all human laws; that is to say, no human laws should be suffered to contradict these. There are, it is true, a great number of indifferent points in which both the divine law and the natural leave a man at his own liberty, but which are found necessary, for the benefit of society, to be restrained within certain limits. And herein it is that human laws have their greatest force and efficacy; for, with regard to such points as are not indifferent, human laws are only declaratory of, and act in subordination to, the former."

… "If man were to live in a state of nature, unconnected with other individuals, there would be no occasion for any other laws than the law of nature, and the law of God. Neither could any other law possibly exist: for a law always supposes some superior who is to make it; and, in a state of nature, we are all equal; without any other superior but Him who is the author of our being." Sir William Blackstone Commentaries on the Laws of England, Vol. 1. *Section II. Of the Nature Of Laws In General*, p.39-42

"Under the law of nature, all men are born free, every one comes into the world with a right to his own person, which includes the liberty of moving and using it at his own will. This is what is called personal liberty, and is given him by the author of nature, because necessary for his own sustenance." Thomas Jefferson

3. The Affirmant hereby claims all rights nunc pro tunc. The Affirmant's undoubted and inalienable rights are the inherent, divine, natural rights that existed prior to the creation of the State (e.g. Monarchy, Crown, Head of State, Parliament, Government et al.), and which, being antecedent to and above the State, can never be taken away, diminished, altered, or levied by the State, except by due process of law. Nor can any inalienable right be fundamentally removed or waived by contract, whether by non-disclosure, which is fraud and unenforceable in law, or knowingly by sufferance, which is contrary to the spirit of the law and prejudicial to sovereignty. The security against contrary precedent of these rights is further enshrined in the Declaration of 12th February of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons [hereinafter referred to as the 'Declaration of Rights'] $168^{8}/_{9}$ – refer to statement 13.

The original, permanent, inalienable rights of every man or woman, include but are not limited to:

- The right to life, freedom and health; and
- The right and free enjoyment of personal liberty; and
- The right to build shelter, to grow food and access natural resources necessary to sustain life; and
- The right to bodily autonomy; and
- The right to freedom of speech; and
- The right to practice a religion and to have beliefs of one's own choosing; and
- The right to travel in the ordinary course of one's life and business
  Represented in Article 42, Magna Carta (1215) 'It is to be lawful in future for every man to depart from our kingdom, and to return to it, safely and securely, by land and water, saving our allegiance, except in time of war for some short time, for the sake of the common utility of the kingdom, [and] excepting those imprisoned and outlawed according to the law of the kingdom, and people from the land against us in war, and merchants who are to be dealt with as aforesaid.'; and
- The right to contract, or not to contract, which is unlimited; and
- The right to earn a living income by being compensated with wages or a salary in a fair exchange for one's work; and
- The right to privacy and confidentiality, free from unwarranted invasion; and
- The right and free enjoyment to own, and hold property, lawfully without trespass; and
- The right and free enjoyment of personal security, free from abuse, persecution, tyranny and war; and
- The right to self-defence when threatened with harm, loss or deceit; and
- The right to due process of law, with notice and opportunity to defend; and
- The right to be presumed innocent, suffering no detention or arrest, no search or seizure, without reasonable cause; and
- The right to equality, to be treated equally in the eyes of the law; and
- The right to a trial by Jury, being a panel of twelve men and women of one's peers; and
- The right to peaceful association, assembly, expression and protest; and
- The right to refuse to kill under command, by reason of conscience; and
- The right to live in peace

**Hebrews Chap. XII Verse XXIII**

"To the generall assembly, and Church of the first borne which are written in heauen, and to God the Iudge of all, and to the spirits of iust men made perfect"

4. It is an established matter of record by Sir William Blackstone in his Commentaries on the Laws of England in Four Books (1753), that it is the Affirmant's birthright to enjoy entire the following rights and liberties:
   "… the rights, or, as they are frequently termed, the liberties of Englishmen: liberties more generally talked of, than thoroughly understood; and yet highly necessary to be perfectly known and considered by every man of rank and property, lest his ignorance of the points whereon they are founded should hurry him into faction and licentious-ness on the one hand, or a pusillanimous indifference and criminal submission on the other. And we have seen that these rights consist, primarily, in the free enjoyment of personal security, of personal liberty, and of private property. So long as these remain inviolate, the subject is perfectly free; for every species of compulsive tyranny and oppression must act in opposition to one or other of these rights, having no other object upon which it can possibly be employed.

To preserve these from violation, it is necessary that the constitution of parliament be supported in its full vigour; and limits, certainly known, be set to the royal prerogative. And, lastly, to vindicate these rights, when actually violated or attacked, the subjects of England are entitled, in the first place, to the regular administration and free course of justice in the courts of law; next, to the right of petitioning the king and parliament for redress of grievances; and, lastly, to the right of having and using arms for self-preservation and defence. And all these rights and liberties it is our birthright to enjoy entire; unless where the laws of our country have laid them under necessary restraints: restraints in themselves so gentle and moderate, as will appear, upon further inquiry, that no man of sense or probity would wish to see them slackened. For all of us have it in our choice to do every thing that a good man would desire to do; and are restrained from nothing but what would be pernicious either to ourselves or our fellow-citizens.";

Furthermore, in the contract reflected in the 'Declaration of Rights' $168^{8}/_{9}$ it is confirmed:

'That it is the Right of the Subjects to Petition the King and all Commitments and Prosecutions for such Petitioning are illegal.'

**Ephesians Chap. IV Verses XV and XVIII**

"But speaking the trueth in loue, may grow vp into him in all things which is the head, euen Christ"
"Hauing the vnderstanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindnesse of their heart."

5. Legem terræ[7] Common Law is the highest jurisdiction of man made law and jurisprudence for the men and women sojourning on the archipelago land mass, including but not limited to submerged areas commonly referred to as the "British Isles" and or the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

6. Legem terræ Common Law is the highest jurisdiction of man made law and jurisprudence for the men and women sojourning on the archipelagos and land masses within the Commonwealth, including but not limited to submerged areas currently or formerly known as Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the union of South Africa, Pakistan, and Ceylon, and of the Monarch's Possessions and other Territories to any of them belonging or pertaining.

7. Legem terræ Common Law reflects the Laws as recorded in the group of books commonly referred to as the Holy Bible and is verified by Sir William Blackstone in his published Commentaries which were instrumental in the framing and establishing of the "British Isles" and or the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's jurisprudence.

8. Article One of the Great Charter 1215[8] [Magna Carta] states:
"**In primis concessisse Deo et hac praesenti carta nostra confirmasse, pro nobis et haeredibus nostris in perpetuum, quod Anglicana ecclesia libera sit, et habeat jura sua integra, et libertates suas illaesas; et its volumus observari; quod apparet ex eo quod libertatem electionum, quae maxima et magis necessaria reputatur ecclesiae Anglicanae, mera et spontanea voluntate, ante discordiam inter nos et barones nostros motam, concessimus et carta nostra confirmavimus, et eam obtinuimus a domino papa Innocentio tertio confirmari; quam et nos observabimus et ab haeredibus nostris in perpetuum bona fide volumus observari. Concessimus etiam omnibus liberis hominibus regni nostri, pro nobis et haeredibus nostris in perpetuum, omnes libertates subscriptas, habendas et tenendas, eis et haeredibus suis, de nobis et haeredibus nostris.**"

"We have first of all granted to God, and by this our present charter confirmed, for ourselves and our heirs in perpetuity, that the English Church is to be free, and to have its full rights and its liberties

[7] Law of the Land, also referred to as Lex terræ
[8] The 'Charter of Runnymede 1215', also referred to as 'The Great Charter' and commonly referred to as 'Magna Carta' since 1217

intact, and we wish this to be observed accordingly, as may appear from our having of our true and unconstrained volition, before discord arose between us and our barons, granted, and by our charter confirmed, the freedom of elections which is deemed to be the English Church's very greatest want, and obtained its confirmation by the lord pope Innocent III; which we will ourselves observe and wish to be observed by our heirs in good faith in perpetuity. And we have also granted to all the free men of our kingdom, for ourselves and our heirs in perpetuity, all the following liberties, for them and their heirs to have and to hold of us and our heirs."

9. Article Thirty-Nine of the Great Charter 1215 [Magna Carta] states:
**"Nullus liber homo capiatur, vel imprisonetur, aut dissaisiatur, aut utlagetur, aut exuletur, aut aliquo modo destruatur, nec super eum ibimus, nec super eum mittemus, nisi per legale judicium parium suorum vel per legem terrae."**

"No free man is to be arrested, or imprisoned, or disseised, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any other way ruined, nor will we go against him or send against him, except by the lawful judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."

10. Article Fifty-Two of the Great Charter 1215 [Magna Carta] states:
"**Si quis fuerit dissaisitus vel elongatus per nos sine legali judicio parium suorum, de terris, castellis, libertatibus, vel jure suo, statim ea ei restituemus; et si contentio super hoc orta fuerit, tunc inde fiat per judicium viginti quinque baronum, de quibus fit mentio inferius in securitate pacis: de omnibus autem illis de quibus aliquis disseisitus fuerit vel elongatus sine legali judicio parium suorum, per Henricum regem patrem nostrum vel per Ricardum regem fratrem nostrum, quae in manu nostra habemus, vel quae alii tenent, quae nos oporteat warantizare, respectum habebimus usque ad communem terminum crucesignatorum; exceptis illis de quibus placitum motum fuit vel inquisitio facta per praeceptum nostrum, ante susceptionem crucis nostrae: cum autem redierimus de peregrinatione nostra, vel si forte remanserimus a peregrinatione nostra, statim inde pleman justiciam exhibebimus.**"

"If anyone has been disseised or dispossessed by us[9], without lawful judgment of his peers[10], of lands, castles, liberties, or of his right, we will restore them to him immediately. And if dispute should arise concerning this[11], then it is to be dealt with by judgment of the twenty-five barons named below in the security for peace[12]. But concerning all those things of which anyone was disseised or dispossessed, without lawful judgment of his peers, by King Henry our father or King Richard our brother, which we have in our hand, or which others hold and which we ought to warrant, we will have respite during the usual crusader's term [of exemption], except for those matters over which a plea was begun or an inquest held on our orders before our taking of the cross. But when we have returned from our crusade, or if perchance we have stayed at home without going on crusade, we will then at once do full justice in such cases."

11. Article Sixty-One of the Great Charter 1215 [Magna Carta] states:
**"Cum autem pro Deo, et ad emendationem regni nostri, et ad melius sopiendum discordiam inter nos et barones nostros ortam, haec omnia praedicta concesserimus, volentes ea integra et firma stabilitate gaudere in perpetuum, facimus et concedimus eis securitatem subscriptam; videlicet quod barones eligant viginti quinque barones de regno quos voluerint, qui debeant pro totis viribus suis observare, tenere, et facere observari, pacem et libertats quas ei concessimus, et hac praesenti carta confirmavimus, ita scilicet quod, si nos, vel justiciarius noster, vel ballivi nostri,**

[9] The King as Monarch
[10] Judgement reached by a trial by Jury of twelve
[11] Between the King (as Monarch) and the plaintiff
[12] Article 61, The Great Charter 1215

**vel aliquis de ministris nostris, in aliquo erga aliquem deliquerimus, vel aliquem articulorum pacis aut securitatis transgressi fuerimus, et delictum ostensum fuerit quatuor baronibus de praedictis viginti quinque baronibus, illi quatuor barones accedant ad nos vel ad justiciarium nostrum, si fuerimus extra regnum, proponentes nobis excessum: petent ut excessum illum sine dilatione faciamus emendari. Et si nos excessum non emendaverimus, vel, si fuerimus extra regnum, justiciarius noster non emendaverit infra tempus quadraginta dierum computandum a tempore quo monstratum fuerit nobis vel justiciario nostro si extra regnum fuerimus, praedicti quatuor barones referant causam illam ad residuos de viginti quinque baronibus, et illi viginti quinque barones cum communia totius terrae distringent et gravabunt nos modis omnibus quibus poterunt, scilicet per captionem castrorum, terrarum, possessionum, et aliis modis quibus poterunt, donec fuerit emendatum secundum arbitrium eorum, salva persona nostra et reginae nostrae et liberorum nostrorum; et cum fuerit emendatum intendent nobis sicut prius fecerunt. Et quicumque voluerit de terra juret quod ad praedicta omnia exsequenda parebit mandatis praedictorum viginti quinque baronum, et quod gravabit nos pro posse suo cum ipsis, et nos publice et libere damus licentiam jurandi cuilibet qui jurare voluerit, et nulli umquam jurare prohibebimus. Omnes autem illos de terra qui per se et sponte sua noluerint jurare viginti quinque baronibus, de distringendo et gravando nos cum eis, faciemus jurare eosdem de mandato nostro, sicut praedictum est. Et si aliquis de viginti quinque baronibus decesserit, vel a terra recesserit, vel aliquo alio modo impeditus fuerit, quo minus ista praedicta possent exsequi, qui residui fuerint de praedictis viginti quinque baronibus eligant alium loco ipsius, pro arbitrio suo, qui simili modo erit juratus quo et ceteri. In omnibus autem quae istis viginti quinque committuntur exsequenda, si forte ipsi viginti quinque praesentes fuerint, et inter se super re aliqua discordaverint, vel aliqui ex eis summoniti nolint vel nequeant interesse, ratum habeatur et firmum quod major pars eorum qui praesentes fuerint providerit, vel praeceperit, ac si omnes viginti quinque in hoc consensissent; et praedicti viginti quinque jurent quod omnia antedicta fideliter observabunt, et pro toto posse suo facient observari. Et nos nihil impetrabimus ab aliquo, per nos nec per alium, per quod aliqua istarum concessionum et libertatum revocetur vel minuatur; et, si aliquid tale impetratum fuerit irritum sit et inane et numquam eo utemur per nos nec per alium."**

"Moreover, since we have granted all these things aforesaid for the sake of God, and for the reform of our kingdom, and the better to still the discord arisen between us and our barons, wishing that these things be enjoyed with a whole and constant stability in perpetuity, we make and grant them the following security: to wit, that the barons are to choose twenty-five barons of the kingdom, whoever they wish, who should with all their strength observe, hold and cause to be observed the peace and liberties which we have granted them, and by this our present charter confirmed, so that if we[9], or our justiciar[13], or our bailiffs, or any of our officers shall in any way offend against anyone, or transgress against any of the articles of peace or security, and the offence has been shown to four of the aforesaid twenty-five barons, those four are to go to us, or to our justiciar if we shall be out of the kingdom, setting forth the transgression, and demand that we have it reformed without delay. And if we do not have the transgression rectified, or, if we are out of the kingdom, our justiciar has not done so, within the space of forty days, counting from the time it was shown to us, or to our justiciar if we were out of the kingdom, the four barons aforesaid are to refer the case to the rest of the twenty-five barons, and those twenty-five barons and the commune of the whole land will distrain and afflict us by every means possible, by taking castles, lands and possessions and in any other ways they can, until it is rectified in accordance with their judgment, albeit sparing our own

[13] The chief political and legal officer second in charge to the King, who deputized for the King in his absence and presided over the Kings' courts. Equivalent to the Prime Minster Governor-General in modern day.

person and the persons of our queen and children. And once the matter has been redressed let them submit to our authority as they did before. And whosoever of the land so wishes is to swear that as to executing all the above he will obey the orders of the twenty-five barons aforesaid, and that with them he will afflict us to the best of his ability, and we openly and freely give permission to swear to whoever wishes to do so, and we will never forbid anyone to swear. But all those of the land who are unwilling to swear individually and voluntarily to the twenty-five barons, to distrain and afflict us with them, we will make them swear by our order as aforesaid. And if any of the twenty-five barons dies, or departs from the land, or is prevented in any other way from being able to act as aforesaid, the remainder of the twenty-five are to choose another man in his place, as they see fit, who will be sworn in like manner as the rest. Moreover in everything which shall be entrusted to the twenty-five barons to carry out, if perchance the twenty-five are present and disagree among themselves over anything, or if any of them, being summoned, will not or cannot attend, what the majority of those who are present shall provide or instruct is to be deemed as determined and binding, as if all twenty-five had agreed to it. And the aforesaid twenty-five will swear that they will faithfully comply with all the aforesaid, and cause it to be upheld to the best of their ability. And we will seek to obtain nothing from anyone, in our own person or through someone else, whereby any of these grants or liberties may be revoked or diminished, and if any such thing be obtained, let it be void and invalid, and we will never make use of it, in our own person or through someone else.'

12. It is a matter of public record that the aforementioned Peace and Security clause : Article-61: of Magna Carta was invoked by the Barons on 23rd March 2001, 40 days following presentment of their petition to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II as a consequence of Prime Minister Anthony Charles Lynton Blair signing the (EU) Treaty of Nice on the 26th January 2001.

13. The following is a matter of record: **Suetonius; Quae praeter consuetudinem & morem maiorum fiunt, neque placent, nec recta videntur**. "Unless things are done according to custom, and the usage of the majority, they will neither be approved nor seem to be right" Coke, Sir. Selected Writings of Sir Edward Coke, vol. I. Liberty Fund, 1600.

Furthermore, it has been agreed as an express contract between the Monarch (the Crown) and the inhabitants of this nation, reflected as the Revolutionary Settlement in the Declaration of 12th February of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal and Commons [hereinafter referred to as the 'Declaration of Rights'] $168^{8}/_{9}$:

'And they do claim, demand and insist upon all and singular the premises as their undoubted rights and liberties, and that no declarations, judgments, doings or proceedings to the prejudice of the people in any of the said premises ought in any wise to be drawn hereafter into consequence or example.

To which demand of their rights they are particularly encouraged by the declaration of his Highness the Prince of Orange as being the only means for obtaining a full redress and remedy therein'

The aforementioned text reflects the Rights and Liberties of the Subjects agreed by King Charles I, as originally enacted in The Petition of Rights (1628):

'XI. All which they most humblie pray of your most Excellent Majestie as their Rightes and Liberties according to the Lawes and Statutes of this Realme, And that your Majestie would alsoe vouchsafe to declare that the Awards doings and proceedings to the prejudice of your people in any of the premisses shall not be drawen hereafter into consequence or example. And that your Majestie would be alsoe graciouslie pleased for the further comfort and safetie of your people to declare your Royall will and pleasure, That in the things aforesaid all your Officers and Ministers shall serve

you according to the Lawes and Statutes of this Realme as they tender the Honor of your Majestie and the prosperitie of this Kingdome.'

14. The following is a matter of record by Sir Edward Coke, Knt. *Reports* Part II (1602):
"Blesse God for Queen Elizabeth, whose continuall charge to her Justices agreeable with her ancient Lawes, is, that for no commandement under the great or privie Seale, writs or letters, common right bee disturbed or delayed. And if any such commandement (upon untrue surmises) should come, that the Justices of her Lawes should not therefore cease to doe right in any point: And this agreeth with the ancient Law of England, declared by the great Charter, and spoken in the person of the King; **Nulli vendemus, nulli negabimus, aut differemus Justiciam vel Rectum**."

15. Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries (volume 1, page 239) says of the Royal Prerogative:
"The splendour, rights, and powers of the Crown were attached to it for the benefit of the people. They form part of, and are, generally speaking, as ancient as the law itself. **De prerogativa regis** is merely declaratory of the Common Law."

**Luke Chap VI. Verse XXXI**
"And as yee would that men should doe to you, doe yee also to them likewise."

16. Sir William Blackstone's Commentaries (volume 1, page 232) *Chapter VI Of The King's Duties*, he writes of the original express contract; The Charter of Runnymede 1215, the Declaration of Rights $168^{8}/_{9}$ and of the Coronation Oath 1688:
"… the duties, incumbent on the king by our constitution; In consideration of which duties his dignity and prerogative are established by the laws of the land: it being a maxim in the law, that protection and subjection are reciprocal. And these reciprocal duties are what, I apprehend, were meant of the convention in 1688, when they declared that king James had broken the original contract between king and people. But, however, as the terms of that original contract were in some measure disputed, being alleged to exist principally in theory, and to be only deducible by reason and the rules of natural law; in which deduction different understandings might very considerably differ; it was, after the revolution, judged proper to declare these duties expressly, and to reduce that contract to a plain certainty. So that, whatever doubts might be formerly raised by weak and scrupulous minds about the existence of such an original contract, they must now entirely cease; especially with regard to every prince who hath reigned since the year 1688."

17. The Coronation Oath as administered to be sworn by His Majesties King George III, King George IV, King George VI and Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II, were not according to the Coronation Oath Act (1688) unto which all Monarchs are to swear in perpetuity. That being acknowledged by the Affirmant, the Oath sworn by both His Majesties King George III, King George IV, King George VI and Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II is a moral obligation, a religious obligation, a sworn obligation, a verbal contractual obligation, a Common Law obligation, a customary obligation, an obligation on all who swear allegiance, it is the duty of government, and it is sworn for the nation, the commonwealth and all dominions.

18. It is a matter of Parliamentary record that on 25th February 1953, Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill acknowledged that at least five previous amendments to the Coronation Oath have been administered since The Act of 6 Anne 1706 [1706 CHAPTER 5 6 Ann] and Union with Scotland Act (1706) [1706 CHAPTER 8 6 Ann] which were not enacted in statute as a revision to the Coronation Oath Act (1688) [1688 CHAPTER 6 1 Will and Mar]. The further amendment of the Coronation Oath as administered during the coronation of Queen Elizabeth II on 2nd June 1953 reflects a total of at least six amendments to the Coronation Oath Act that have not been enacted, raising doubt over the legitimacy of all Statutory Enactments, Commandments and Treaties since the demise of Queen Anne in 1714.

    "Her Majesty's Government propose to follow this long line of precedents. To accept the view that changes in the terms of the Oath which are necessary to reconcile it with a changed constitutional position cannot be made except with the authority of an Act of Parliament would be to cast doubt upon the validity of the Oath administered to every Sovereign of this country since George I."
    Prime Minister Sir Winston Churchill [Hansard: HC Deb 25 February 1953 vol 511 cc2091-3]

    **I Kings Chap IX. Verse IV**
    "And if thou wilt walke before me, as Dauid thy father walked, in integritie of heart, and in vprightnesse, to doe according to all that I haue commanded thee, and wilt keepe my Statutes, and my Iudgements"

19. An Oath sworn by a King or Queen that is not in accordance with the Coronation Oath Act (1688), does not abnegate the fact that it is an unlawful use of the Royal Prerogative to subvert the rights and liberties of the Affirmant, and is contrary to the ruling in Nichols v Nichols (1576) 75 ER 726.

    **Proverbs Chap XX. Verse VII**
    "The iust man walketh in his integritie: his children are blessed after him."

20. In the following correspondence from Jack Straw, Home Secretary, to Howard Flight Esq. MP on 20th July 2000 he confirms:
    "I am replying in light of my Constitutional responsibilities.
    I can confirm the Coronation Oath is a solemn undertaking by the Sovereign and is regarded as binding throughout Her reign. Her Majesty would not be advised to give Her assent to a provision which contradicted that oath.
    Yours ever
    Jack Straw"

21. The Accession Declaration Oath sworn by King Charles III on 10th day of September in the year Two Thousand Twenty-Two, is acknowledged by the Affirmant. Since Royal Assent is a prerogative of the Crown under constitutional restraint of the Common Law and custom, the Affirmant believes that His Majesty's use of the Royal Prerogative to subvert their rights and liberties, at any time henceforth, would be contrary to the ruling in Nichols v Nichols (1576) 75 ER 726.
    'Prerogative is created for the benefit of the people and cannot be exercised to their prejudice'

22. Use of the Great or Privy Seal (including under the Demise of the Crown Act (1702)) to give Royal Assent of any Bill or commandment seeking to subvert the Affirmant's undoubted and inalienable rights, and the ancient customs afforded for the benefit of educating the Affirmant's offspring and those under their guardianship in the form, belief, and ethical code as the Affirmant so chooses is morally repugnant and dishonourable. To subvert these and any other rights and customs is in direct conflict with the Constitution of the "British Isles" (and or the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland) and that of the Commonwealth and Dominions, with The Charter of Runnymede

(1215) [also known as The Great Charter and Magna Carta (1215)] and, above all, with The Coronation Oath 1688 (as acknowledged above) and the Oaths of Office of His Majesty's Ministers.

23. King Charles III by swearing the Accession Declaration Oath has bound himself to defend the Protestant faith, and thereby the laws contained within the Holy Bible as established herein (in particular but not limited to statements 7 and 8). Furthermore, to preserve and maintain the rights and liberties specified in and according to the following: The Charter of Runnymede 1215 *(The Great Charter)*, Act of Supremacy 1558 [1558 CHAPTER 1 1 Eliz 1], Act of Supremacy (Ireland) 1560 [1560 CHAPTER 1 2 Eliz 1], Act of Settlement (1700) [1700 CHAPTER 2 12 and 13 Will 3], Union with Scotland Act 1706 [1706 CHAPTER 8 6 Ann], the Union with Scotland (Amendment) Act 1707 [1707 CHAPTER 40 6 Ann], the Union with England Act 1707, the Succession to the Crown Act 1707 [1707 CHAPTER 41 6 Ann] together with the Protestant Religion and Presbyterian Church Act 1707), the Declaration of Rights ($168^{8}/_{9}$) and Claim of Right Act 1689. His Majesty's duty (reflected in statement 16) is therefore to protect and uphold the rights and liberties of all the inhabitants according to the Common Laws (as reflected in the Holy Bible) and customs of this realm, such that the Affirmant is neither disseised nor dispossessed of those rights and liberties (both spiritual and civil) unless by a lawful judgment of the Affirmant's peers (statement 10), namely a trial by jury of 12 peers under Common Law.

    "The King himself should be under no man, but under God and the Law." Sir Edward Coke

    "the king must not be subject to any man, but to God and the law, because the law makes him king." Bracton, lib. 1, c. 8.

24. Therefore, from the spiritual point of view, it is unimaginable that His Majesty would seek (including his heirs or successors), in effect, a divorce from his duty, that would give Royal Assent of any Bill or permit any Act to remain on the statute that would give rise to a subversion of the rights and liberties of the Affirmant (examples referenced within statements 44 and 45). The Affirmant respectfully petitions His Majesty to use the Crown's jurisdiction to hold those men and women accountable for their acts proven to conflict with, or be repugnant to the Constitution[15].

25. It is on record that Parliamentary assembly was initiated during the reign of His Majesty King Henry III, under his direct authority and to whom he delegated Simon de Montfort 8th Earl of Leicester, to summon and assemble representatives from his lands and subjects. The second session of Parliament was initiated on 14th December 1264 in which Simon de Montfort summoned 23 lay magnates, 120 bishops, two knights from each county and two citizens from each town. Also summoned were four men from each of the Cinque Ports, this assembly of Parliament began on 20th January 1265. The Crown both opens and dissolves Parliamentary sessions, both Houses of Parliament (Lords and Commons) sit in session under the Crown's delegated authority to debate and present laws for Royal Assent; turning a Bill into an Enactment (Act) of Parliament, allowing it to become law statute.

    **Romans Chap XIII. Verse I**

    "Let euery soule bee subiect vnto the higher powers: For there is no power but of God. The powers that be, are ordeined of God."

26. It is a matter of record that the Crown (King or Queen) cannot change any part of the Common Law or the customs of this realm (see example in statement 28)
    As a Maxim in Law **Ubi eadem ratio, ibi eadem lex; et de similibus idem est judicium** : The current incarnation of Parliament[14] was brought into being at the request of the Crown (His Majesty King Henry III) and as the "King" does not have royal prerogative to execute Law which is at odds with such

[14] Acknowledging the Michel-gemot and Witenagemote of Saxon Kings together with the Commissions of King Alfred The Great as the precursors to the Parliament since 1265

Common Law or customs, then by reason and logic according to the maxim, Parliament does not possess such powers either.

**The Common Laws and customs of this realm hold perpetual and permanent lawful and moral supremacy over law statute and powers of the Crown's prerogative** (confirmed in statement 30).

"Reason is the life of the law; nay, the common law itself is nothing else but reason.... The law, which is perfection of reason." Sir Edward Coke

27. Claims of so-named *Parliamentary Sovereignty* since 1688 are contrary to Constitution[15] and are hereby rebutted and evidenced with reference to Sir Edward Coke (1610) (see also Statement 30), Sir William Blackstone in his Commentaries (1753), Sir T. Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice – Book 1: Constitution, Powers and Privileges of Parliament and Lords Hope and Steyn in their judgements (R (Jackson) v Attorney General [2005] UKHL 56; [2006] 1 AC 262):

"And it appeareth in our Books, that in many Cases, the Common Law doth controll Acts of Parliament, and somtimes shall adjudge them to be void: for when an Act of Parliament is against Common right and reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, the Common Law will controll it, and adjudge such Act to be void;" Sir Edward Coke, Dr Bonhams' Case[16]

"when the constitution was restored in all its forms, it was particularly enacted by statute 13 Car. II. c.1, that if any person shall maliciously or advisedly affirm that both or either of the houses of parliament have any legislative authority without the king, such person shall incur all the penalties of a prœmunire[17]." Sir William Blackstone Book 1, *Of the Rights of Persons* (Chap. 2) p.159

"The Act of Settlement (12 & 13 Will. III. c. 2) affirms that the "laws of England are the birthright of the people thereof; and all the kings and queens who shall ascend the throne of this realm ought to administer the government of the same according to the said laws; and all their officers and ministers ought to serve them respectively according to the same." . . . Nor was this a modern principle of constitutional law, established, for the first time, by the Revolution of 1688. If not admitted in its whole force so far back as the great charter of King John, it has been affirmed by Parliament in very ancient times." Erskine May (p.3 12th Edition Ch1) Butterworth & Co. 1917

"…the courts have a part to play in defining the limits of Parliament's legislative sovereignty.": [107] "…the rule of law enforced by the courts is the ultimate controlling factor on which our constitution is based.": [107] Lord Hope, R (Jackson) v Attorney General [2005] UKHL 56; [2006] 1 AC 262

"…in exceptional circumstances involving an attempt to abolish judicial review or the ordinary role of the courts, the Appellate Committee of the House of Lords or a new Supreme Court may have to consider whether this is constitutional fundamental which even a sovereign Parliament acting at the behest of a complaisant House of Commons cannot abolish.": [102]
Lord Steyn, R (Jackson) v Attorney General [2005] UKHL 56; [2006] 1 AC 262

**Genesis Chap XX. Verse IX**

"Then Abimelech called Abraham, and said vnto him, What hast thou done vnto vs? and what haue I offended thee, that thou hast brought on me, and on my kingdome a great sinne? thou hast done deeds vnto mee that ought not to be done."

[15] As written in the constitution commonly known as The Great Charter 1215 (also known as 'Magna Carta')
[16] Sir Edward Coke, Part Eight of the Reports : Dr Bonhams' Case. p.264
[17] Statute of Prœmunire 1392 [16 Rich. 2, c.5]

28. The following statements by LORD-CHIEF-JUSTICE-OF-ENGLAND-AND-WALES, THE-MASTER-OF-THE-ROLLS and LORD-JUSTICE-SALES [R (Miller) v Secretary of State [2016] EWHC 2768 (Admin)] confirm the aforementioned statement 26, that the Common Laws and customs of this realm hold supremacy over enacted statute law and powers of the Crown's prerogative. The Lords use of the term and claim below of the so-named *Parliamentary Sovereignty* is rebutted, with evidence, in statement 27 by the Affirmant.

**"**The extent of the powers of the Crown under its prerogative (often called the royal prerogative) are delineated by UK constitutional law. These prerogative powers constitute the residue of legal authority left in the hands of the Crown. As Lord Reid said in Burmah Oil Co (Burma Trading) Ltd v Lord Advocate [1965] AC 75, at 101:

> *"The prerogative is really a relic of a past age, not lost by disuse, but only available for a case not covered by statute."*

An important aspect of the fundamental principle of Parliamentary sovereignty is that primary legislation is not subject to displacement by the Crown through the exercise of its prerogative powers. But the constitutional limits on the prerogative powers of the Crown are more extensive than this. The Crown has only those prerogative powers recognised by the Common Law and their exercise only produces legal effects within boundaries so recognised. Outside those boundaries the Crown has no power to alter the law of the land, whether it be Common Law or contained in legislation.

This subordination of the Crown (i.e. the executive government) to law is the foundation of the rule of law in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. It has its roots well before the war between the Crown and Parliament in the seventeenth century but was decisively confirmed in the settlement arrived at with the Glorious Revolution in 1688 and has been recognised ever since.

Sir Edward Coke reports the considered view of himself and the senior judges of the time in The Case of Proclamations (1610) 12 Co. Rep. 74, that:

> "the King by his proclamation or other ways cannot change any part of the Common Law, or statute law, or the customs of the realm"

and that:

> "the King hath no prerogative, but that which the law of the land allows him."

The position was confirmed in the first two parts of section 1 of the Bill of Rights 1688:

> "Suspending power – That the pretended power of suspending of laws or the execution of laws by regall authority without consent of Parlyament is illegall.
>
> Late dispensing power – That the pretended power of dispensing with laws or the execution of laws by regall authoritie as it hath beene assumed and exercised of late is illegall."

The legal position was summarised by the Privy Council in The Zamora [1916] 2 AC 77, at 90:

"The idea that the King in Council, or indeed any branch of the Executive, has power to prescribe or alter the law to be administered by Courts of law in this country is out of harmony with the principles of our Constitution. It is true that, under a number of modern statutes, various branches of the Executive have power to make rules having the force of statutes, but all such rules derive their validity from the statute which creates the power, and not from the executive body by which they are made. No one would contend that the prerogative involves any power to prescribe or alter the law administered in Courts of Common Law or Equity…" **"**

29. The following is a matter of record and was stated in Parliament in the 20th year of the reign of His Majesty King Henry III: **Omnes Comites & Barones una voce responderunt, Nolumus leges Anglia mutare quae hucusque usitatae sunt & approbatae**. "All the Earls and Barons answered with one voice, We will not change the old laws of England heretofore used and approved". Coke, Sir. Selected Writings of Sir Edward Coke, vol. I. Liberty Fund, 1600, p.96.

    **Galatians Chap V. Verse I**

    "Stand fast therefore in the libertie wherewith Christ hath made vs free, and bee not intangled againe with the yoke of bondage."

30. The following is a matter of record from a speech both in Parliament (Autumn 1610) by Sir Edward Coke and recorded in his *Reports* Part VIII – Dr Bonhams' Case:

    "And it appeareth in our Books, that in many Cases, the Common Law doth controll Acts of Parliament, and somtimes shall adjudge them to be void: for when an Act of Parliament is against Common right and reason, or repugnant, or impossible to be performed, the Common Law will controll it, and adjudge such Act to be void;"

31. The following is a matter of record that Sir William Blackstone in his Commentaries (Book 1 Vol.1 p.124-p.125) states that the principal reason for the role of Monarch and Parliament to exist, is to protect and enforce the absolute natural rights of individuals which exist prior to the formation of the state:

    "…the principal aim of society is to protect individuals in the enjoyment of those absolute rights, which were vested in them by the immutable laws of nature, but which could not be preserved in peace without that mutual assistance and intercourse which is gained by the institution of friendly and social communities. Hence it follows, that the first and primary end of human laws is to maintain and regulate these absolute rights of individuals. Such rights as are social and relative result from, and are posterior to, the formation of states and societies: so that to maintain and regulate these is clearly a subsequent consideration. And, therefore, the principal view of human laws is, or ought always to be, to explain, protect, and enforce such rights as are absolute…"

    "The absolute rights of man, considered as a free agent, endowed with discernment to know good from evil, and with power of choosing those measures which appear to him to be most desirable, are usually summed up in one general appellation, and denominated the natural liberty of mankind."

32. The following is a matter of record pertaining to the Rights and Liberties of the Subjects – Petition of Rights (1628). Reaffirming Article 39 of the Magna Carta, that no free man (or woman) shall have their liberty or free customs wrongfully removed other than by a jury of twelve peers or by Common Law:

    'III. And whereas also by the statute called "The Great Charter of the liberties of England," it is declared and enacted that no freeman may be taken or imprisoned or be disseised of his freeholds or liberties, or his free customs, or be outlawed or exiled, or in any manner destroyed, but by the lawful judgment of his peers, or by the law of the land.'

33. The Affirmant believes that His Majesty King Charles III's statements on the public record and maintained associations with foreign potentates are in conflict with his current duties and obligations under the Constitution, which says "… we will not deny or defer to any man either Justice or Right".

34. In respect of Statements 15, 16, 21, 32, 33 and 47; the Affirmant hopes that His Majesty King Charles III graciously considers and accepts the request to make a public retraction of all statements, allegiances and associations with foreign princes, prelates, states or potentates promoting ideologies repugnant to the Constitution, or that denies or defers justice and the absolute natural rights of the Affirmant[18], or of the men, women, boys and girls inhabiting the lands to which His Majesty is Monarch.

35. It has long been established prior to the first assembly of Parliament, that the rights of a mother, father or guardian under Common Law and the customs of this realm are free to choose the methods, modalities, educators, physical location, religious dogma or belief and ethical code under which their offspring are to be educated. The custom of education (knowledge and skills) passed from generation to generation through mentor-mentee, home tutoring/tutelage, apprenticeship et al. free from the oversight or control of Government, a custom long established prior to the modern concept of an education system. Principles established by centuries of custom that have never been judged as pernicious. Customs recorded in antiquity prior to Christian teachings, refer to statement 1.

36. The Affirmant believes the principles proposed by His Majesty's Ministers in creating the Schools Bill {HL35/49} is an intolerable attack, a trespass, on their right to religious freedom. Such proposals include the expansion of the academisation programme introduced over the last 15 years which has disrupted the Local Authority system for overseeing and supporting schools, with the introduction promising greater autonomy, and even a greater share of finances. Many Christians and other faiths have engaged in starting free schools in this developing new system and opportunity, but many schools also maintained their Christian ethos and values, remaining within the Local authority structures and Church of England diocesan structures for Voluntary Aided and Voluntary Controlled schools.

    **Proverbs Chap I. Verse VII**

    "The feare of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge: but fooles despise wisedome and instruction."

    The Schools Bill will require all schools to become academies, and all academies to become part of large Multi Academy Trusts (hereinafter referred to as "MAT" or "MATs"), which may or may not hold Christian values. State schools with a Christian heritage may be overseen by governors and trustees within such MATs who have no love for Jesus. Free from the laws on Religious Education and collective worship, the schools in these trusts can leave behind for good the Christian foundations and teachings on which they were built.

    It has already been shown that 50% of Academy schools without a religious character do not meet their contractual or legal requirements for religious education.

    **Isaiah Chap LIV. Verse XIII**

    "And all thy children shalbe taught of the Lord, and great shalbe the peace of thy children."

37. The principles promoted in the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} for new academies are that these are established only at state provided locations, preventing the future possibility that any new church or faith school can be set up. The Department for Education (hereinafter referred to as "DfE") is creating a system which seeks to prevent new faith or church schools from being set up. This bill also limits existing trusts, church and faith schools from expanding to accommodate the number of people that want to take advantage of a more morally correct education that retains children's innocence for as long as possible. These schools would lose the right to receive or purchase extra land for their school. The Schools Bill {HL 35/49} would provide the DfE with the right to close down independent schools and make it an offence for the school to continue to operate.

[18] Refer to Statements 3 and 31

Independent schools will need to apply for DfE approval if they change their details, including: the proprietor, the address, the age range of pupils, the maximum number of pupils, whether the school is for boys or girls and whether it provides accommodation.

"The ultimate tragedy is not the oppression and cruelty by the bad people but the silence over that of good people." Martin Luther King, JR

The Affirmant believes that the ideology promoted by His Majesty's Government and His Majesty's Ministers via the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} and powers delegated to the DfE would restrict Independent, Trust and Faith schools with unfair trade practices, furthermore they seek to dictate, limit and trespass upon their rights to having their offspring and those under their guardianship to be educated in a faith, independent or trust school to instil the moral and ethical foundations as aforementioned and established in statement 22.

**Jeremiah Chap XXIX. Verse XXXII**

"Therefore thus saith the Lord, Behold, I will punish Shemaiah the Nehelamite and his seed: he shall not haue a man to dwell among this people, neither shall hee behold the good that I will doe for my people, saith the Lord, because he hath taught rebellion against the Lord."

**Psalm Chap XXXII. Verse VIII**

"I will instruct thee, and teach thee in the way which thou shalt goe: I will guide thee with mine eye."

38. The Education Act 1944 established the appointment of a Minister for Education by His Majesty King George VI, to promote the education of the people of England and Wales and the progressive development of institutions devoted to that purpose. Whilst the State involvement has continued to take control over every aspect of the education system with an updated Education Act 1996, it has maintained a requirement for Christian worship and Christian teaching in all schools.
However, such moral teachings in Religious Education have gradually eroded and the present ideology promoted and being represented within the text of the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} provides that worship and Religious Education arrangements in academies can be changed or even removed by DfE regulations.

**Proverbs Chap XI. Verse III**

"The integritie of the vpright shall guide them: but the peruersenesse of transgressours shall destroy them."

**Ephesians Chap VI. Verse I**

"Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right."

The Affirmant believes the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} promotes further ideological changes to existing laws and the local structures which embed the moral and ethical teaching of Religious Education in the timetables of our schools, at a time when there has never been more of a need for such guidance in society.

**Proverbs III Verse XXVII**

"Withhold not good from them to whom it is due, when it is in the power of thine hand to doe it."

The Affirmant believes in the ancient traditions and customs which have been the foundation of our British society, a society built on the principles of the Holy Bible. Schools built on 'values' that have no Biblical or other faith foundations will produce children with no moral foundation or ethical code.

The Affirmant believes that boys and girls from different faith backgrounds should have the right to worship within state schools or attend independent faith schools of their choice without hindrance from the state. The Affirmant believes that the ideology of absolutism that has perpetuated since

the Glorious Revolution is both a hypocrisy and a trespass on their ancient liberties and inalienable rights as expressed in statement 3.

"I will tell you what to hate. Hate hypocrisy; hate cant; hate intolerance, oppression, injustice, Pharisaism, hate them as Christ hated them - with a deep abiding God like hatred." Fredrick W. Robertson

39. The Affirmant is incandescent with the intention of conferring powers to the DfE which includes:
    - Decisions over School governance, since the Bill {HL 35/49} gives the DfE power to remove governors and replace them directly;
    - The DfE will have the power to set school hours and term times removing any freedom of choice from school heads and governors;
    - The DfE will have the right to set admission procedures, regardless of the current admission policies of each school;
    - The DfE will have the right to set absence policies, completely removing the right of any parent or guardian to obtain permission from the head teacher for term time off for any reason;
    - The DfE will set fines for absences and has already indicated that these will be punitive;
    - The DfE will control how the proprietors of a school spend their money, completely removing their autonomy.

    **Psalm Chap IX. Verses VII-X**

    "But the Lord shall endure for euer: he hath prepared his throne for iudgement.
    And hee shall iudge the world in righteousnesse; he shall minister iudgement to the people in vprightnesse.
    The Lord also will bee a refuge for the oppressed: a refuge, in times of trouble.
    And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee: for thou Lord hast not forsaken them that seeke thee."

    The Affirmant holds the belief that the Headteacher and the Board of Governors decide the tone of a school, a mothers', a fathers', or a guardians' choice over selecting a suitable school includes the vision held by a forward-thinking Headteacher or a forward-looking Board of governors. The certainty and stability afforded by the vision of such key persons is paramount, the decision making of the Affirmant to choose a specific school would be negated should the DfE amend its regulations or rules which are contrary to the vision and ethical code previously established within a chosen school.

    **Proverbs Chap XXII. Verse VI**

    "Traine vp a childe in the way he should goe: and when he is olde, hee will not depart from it."

40. The ideology being promoted within the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} seeks to undermine the role of a teacher in the education system by stringent new rules. Previously a school headteacher had some say in the grading and renumeration of a teacher as it related to their abilities, this was especially true for Independent, Trust and Faith based schools. However, whatever your ability, if you are a teacher, the DfE will now directly set the salary level. The Affirmant is concerned that the DfE will be granted the power to prevent teachers from teaching not only in schools, but also online and remotely if they do not comply on moral and ethical grounds – effectively criminalising a teacher that doesn't comply with DfE prescribed rules.
    Should the Affirmant freely elect to utilise a tutor, or use out of school classes, the service provider will be under a duty to provide the details of the Affirmant's offspring or those under their guardianship to the local authority together with the curriculum and subject matter being taught. This is a trespass upon the Affirmant's rights and a complete overreach by the State.

    **Luke Chap VI. Verse XL**

    "The disciple is not aboue his master: but euery one that is perfect shalbe as his master."

41. The Affirmant believes these ideologies will have a detrimental effect on the schooling of their offspring and those under their guardianship, restricting and effectively abnegating their right over choice of education (knowledge and skills) as the established custom of this realm (refer to statements 35 and 22). Furthermore, such restrictions will inevitably control what the Independent, Trust and Faith schools pay their teachers, supplemental income derived from private tutoring and what knowledge, positive morals and values teachers are permitted to impart.

**Proverbs Chap IX. Verse IX**

"Giue instruction to a wise man, and he will be yet wiser: teach a iust man, and he will increase in learning."

42. The ideologies promoted within the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} directly trespass upon the common rights of the Affirmant to home educate their offspring and those under their guardianship. The measures that home educating families will face is truly stupefying and places restrictions upon the liberties and rights hitherto mentioned earlier, a few of which are listed here:
    - Each child not in school to be registered with the local authority with potential for failure to comply by the Affirmant being a criminal offence;
    - The Affirmant will be under a duty to supply the local authority with any information that it demands, under threat of fines or imprisonment if the Affirmant fails to do so, or even if a clerical error is made in doing so;
    - Should the Affirmant choose to utilise a tutor, or out of school classes, the service provider will be under a duty to provide their offspring's details, or those under their guardianship, to the local authority. If the tutor or service provider fails to provide the information, or makes a clerical error, they can face closure, fines and loss of their business;
    - Should the Affirmant choose a family member to educate their offspring or a child under their guardianship and they have an Education Health and Care Plan (hereinafter referred to as "EHCP") (or 5 boys and/or girls or more) for some of the time, they will have to register as a school and face OFSTED inspection and the duties that schools have to provide personal information to the local authority;
    - Any 'setting' which provides education to one child with an EHCP or 5 or more without an EHCP will have to register as a school: no exceptions are made for childminders, tutors, after school clubs, forest schools, relatives and large families who home educate;
    - The Schools Bill {HL 35/49} abjugates the Affirmants' right to remove their offspring, or those under their guardianship, from a school without oversight of the local authority, regardless of how that authority has already failed the boy or girl; and
    - Should the Affirmant's offspring, or those under their guardianship, have an EHCP and I am served with a school attendance order, the intent within the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} would prevent me from ever having it revoked, even if the Affirmant moves from the area or the education that the state provides is unsuitable.

**Ehphesians Chap VI. Verse IX**

"And ye masters, do the same things vnto them, forbearing threatning: knowing that your master also is in heauen, neither is there respect of persons with him."

**Mark Chap X. Verse XLII-XLIV**

"But Iesus called them to him, and saith vnto them, Yee know that they which are accompted to rule ouer the Gentiles, exercise Lordship ouer them: and their great ones exercise authoritie vpon them.

But so shall it not be among you: but whosoeuer will bee great among you, shall be your minister: And whosoeuer of you will bee the chiefest, shalbe seruant of all."

**Proverbs Chap I. Verses VIII-IX**

"My sonne, heare the instruction of thy father, and forsake not the law of thy mother.
For they shall be an ornament of grace vnto thy head, and chaines about thy necke."

**Ephesians Chap VI. Verse IV**

"And yee fathers, prouoke not your children to wrath: but bring them vp in the nourture and admonition of the Lord"

43. The Affirmant believes that His Majesty's Government is trespassing against their inalienable rights of freedom, property and privacy by introducing a requirement to report to the local authority if either their offspring or those under their guardianship, takes time off school or home education to attend an appointment as it is the Affirmants' private business.

**Matthew Chap XIX. Verse XIV**

"But Iesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come vnto me: for of such is ye kingdome of heauen."

**III John Chap I. Verse IV**

"I haue no greater ioy, then to heare that my children walke in truth."

44. The Affirmant's wishes as an elector are in opposition to the key principles and ideologies contained within the following proposed statutes currently in session 2022-23:

Schools Bill {HL BILL 35/49}, Online Safety Bill {HC 609}, Bill of Rights Bill {HC 117}, Ecology Bill {HL 13/70}, Data Protection and Digital Information Bill {HC 143}, Public Order Bill {HC 116 / HL 61}; and

the following General Public Enactments of Parliament:

Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022; Dissolution and Calling of Parliament Act 2022; the Judicial Review and Courts Act 2022; The Elections Act 2022; the Nationality and Borders Act 2022; the Genetic Technology (Precision Breeding) Act 2023;

to which the Affirmant will be commanded and is being kept alive by Members of both Houses of Parliament:

> "The judges know nothing about any will of the people except in so far as that will is expressed by an Act of Parliament, and would never suffer the validity of a statute to be questioned on the ground of its having been passed or being kept alive in opposition to the wishes of the electors."
> R (Miller) v Secretary of State [2016] EWHC 2768 (Admin)

45. The Affirmant's common rights are being disturbed[19] by the ideologies proposed and contained within the so-named Schools Bill {HL BILL 35/49}, Online Safety Bill {HC 609}, Bill of Rights Bill {HC 117}, Ecology Bill {HL 13/70}, Data Protection and Digital Information Bill {HC 143}, Public Order Bill {HC 116 / HL 61} currently in session 2022-23 and the Police, Crime, Sentencing and Courts Act 2022, Dissolution and Calling of Parliament Act 2022, the Judicial Review and Courts Act 2022, The Elections Act 2022, the Nationality and Borders Act 2022, the Genetic Technology (Precision Breeding) Act 2023 according to the herein stated matters of record.

"**Contra legem & consuetudinem Angliae**. Against the Law and custom of England." Sir Edward Coke, Reports Vol.XII, 1610.

[19] Reference statement 14 "that for no commandement under the great or privie Seale, writs or letters, common right bee disturbed or delayed"

46. The principles being proposed within the Schools Bill {HL 35/49} if made into an Act of Law will be a trespass upon the Affirmant's undoubted and inalienable rights (as stated in 3), under The Charter of Runneymede (1215) [also known as The Great Charter / Magna Carta] and under Common Law according to the herein stated matters of record.

47. The Affirmant considers the following international agreements and treaties to be intolerable acts against their undoubted and inalienable rights (as stated in 3): Article 29(3) of Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UN World Health Organisation International Health Regulations (2005), G20 Bali Leaders' Declaration 'G20 Action for Strong and Inclusive Recovery' (Bali, Indonesia, 15-16 November 2022) and the proposed UN World Health Organisation's so-named 'Pandemic Treaty' or 'Accord' that may result in further updates to the UN WHO International Health Regulations.

**Deuteronomy Chap XVII. Verse VI**

At the mouth of two witnesses, or three withnesses, shall he that is worthy of death, be put to death: but at the mouth of one witnesse he shall not bee put to death.

**Deuteronomy Chap XIX. Verse XV**

One witnesse shall not rise vp against a man for any iniquitie, or for any sinne, in any sinne that he sinneth: at the mouth of two witnesses, or at the mouth of three witnesses, shall the matter be stablished.

**II.Corinthians Chap XIII. Verse I**

This is the third time I am comming to you: in the mouth of two or three witnesses shal euery word be established.

**Hebrews Chap X. Verse XXVIII**

Hee that despised Moses Lawe, died without mercy, vnder two or three witnesses.

**AFFIDAVIT**

I, : First-middle-middle: Last name , Affirmant, a woman , do affirm and say that I have read the above Affidavit and do know the contents to the very best of my knowledge to be true, correct, complete and not misleading; the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, autographed at ..... on the ..... day of ..... in the Year Two Thousand and Twenty-Three.

..... , All Rights Reserved .....
Claimant/Affirmant [print] [autograph]

c/o House/Flat Name/No., Road, Town / City, County, England/Wales/ Scotland etc [No Postcode]

.....
Witness [autograph]

.....
Witness [autograph]

---

Before me, the undersigned Commissioner for Oaths, appeared I, : First-middle-middle: Last name , known to me to be the one whose name is subscribed above, and acknowledged execution of the same for the purposes therein contained.

Witness my hand and official seal this ……. day of ……., 2023.

.....
COMMMISSIONER FOR OATHS